

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI
CENTRAL DIVISION**

WILLIAM BILLY GENE CARTER,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	Case No. 13-4174-CV-C-NKL-P
vs.)	
)	
KEITH SCHAEFER, et al.,,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTIONS FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL, MOTION
FOR COURT ORDER, AND MOTION FOR COPIES WITHOUT PREJUDICE AND
DIRECTING DEFENDANTS TO RESPOND**

Plaintiff has filed a second and third motion for appointment of counsel (Doc. Nos. 23 and 26), a motion for copies (Doc. No. 24), and a motion for Court Order (Doc. No. 25). As the Court informed plaintiff in the September 16, 2013, Order denying plaintiff's first motion for appointment of counsel (Doc. No. 19), an indigent has no statutory or constitutional right to have counsel appointed in a civil action for damages. Wiggins v. Sargent, 753 F.2d 663 (8th Cir. 1985); Randall v. Wyrick, 642 F.2d 304 (8th Cir. 1981). Because the record has not been developed sufficiently to determine if appointment of counsel is justified under the standards set forth in that Order, it is **ORDERED** that plaintiff's second and third motions for appointment of counsel (Doc. Nos. 23 and 26) are denied without prejudice.

It is further **ORDERED** that plaintiff's motion for copies of all of his documents (Doc. No. 24) is denied without prejudice in that photocopies cost 10 cents per page for every document filed electronically and 50 cents per page for all other copies. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915, even those persons granted leave to proceed in forma pauperis cannot receive free photocopies and must pay for any copies they receive from the Court. If plaintiff seeks copies of certain documents he has filed in this case, he first must identify those documents and next must send a check or money order to the Clerk of

the Court for the required amount to copy those documents. If plaintiff wants to keep copies of pleadings he files in this case but does not have money to pay for photocopies, he should handwrite a duplicate of each pleading he mails to the Court.

It is further **ORDERED** that plaintiff's motion for Court Order requiring defendants to answer plaintiff's complaint and to set a case management order (Doc. No. 25) is denied in that defendants properly have filed a motion to dismiss to which plaintiff has been ordered to respond and in that this Court granted defendants' motion to stay this case for the reasons set forth in Doc. Nos. 28 and 29.

Finally, it is **ORDERED** that defendants file a response, on or before January 10, 2014, to plaintiff's motion for Court Order prohibiting defendants from opening plaintiff's legal mail (Doc. No. 35).

/s/ Nanette K. Laughrey
NANETTE K. LAUGHREY
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Jefferson City, Missouri,

Dated: 12/16/2013.